arXiv:1604.04933v2 [math.AC] 16 Jun 2016

ON PLANE POLYNOMIAL AUTOMORPHISMS COMMUTING WITH SIMPLE DERIVATIONS

LUÍS GUSTAVO MENDES AND IVAN PAN

1. INTRODUCTION

We denote by $\mathbb{K}[x,y]$ the ring of polynomials in two variables over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic zero, and by $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x,y])$ the group consisting of $\mathbb{K}$-linear automorphisms of $\mathbb{K}[x,y]$.

A *derivation* of $\mathbb{K}[x,y]$ is a $\mathbb{K}$-linear map $D:\mathbb{K}[x,y]\to\mathbb{K}[x,y]$ such that $D(fg)=gD(f)+fD(g)$ for all $f,g\in\mathbb{K}[x,y]$. We denote by $\mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x,y])$ the $\mathbb{K}-$linear vector space of derivations of $\mathbb{K}[x,y]$; this is, in fact, a $\mathbb{K}[x,y]$-module.

If $D\in\mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x,y])$ we denote by $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ the subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x,y])$ consisting of automorphisms commuting with D. In other words, $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x,y])$ acts on $\mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x,y])$ by conjugation as

$$\rho\cdot D=\rho D\rho^{-1},\quad \rho\in\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x,y]),\quad D\in\mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x,y]),$$

and $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ is the isotropy of D with respect to that action.

A derivation D is said to be *simple* if it does not stabilize a nontrivial ideal.

Finally, a derivation of the form

$$D=\partial_x+(ay+b)\partial_y,\ a,b\in\mathbb{K}[x]$$

is said to be a *Shamsuddin derivation*. In [Sh1977] there is a criterion which allows to decide whether D is simple or not, depending if the equation $D(h)=ah+b$ has no solution $h\in\mathbb{K}[x]$ or admits such a solution, respectively. It follows trivially that a Shamsuddin derivation with $a=0$ is not simple.

In [Ba, Thm.6] it is proved that $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ is trivial if D is a simple Shamsuddin derivation.

The main result of this work, proved in the next section, is the following:

Theorem 1. *If D is a simple derivation, then* $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ *is trivial.*

In the last section we describe the isotropy group of a Shamsuddin derivation with $a\neq 0$ (Proposition 9) and prove, as an application, the following:

Research of L.G.Mendes was partially supported by Pronex/CNPq of Brazil.
Research of I. Pan was partially supported by ANII and PEDECIBA of Uruguay.

Theorem 2. *Let D be a Shamsuddin derivation with $a \neq 0$. Then D is simple if and only if* $\mathrm{Aut}(D) = \{id\}$.

Let us now make some remarks in order to connect our results with other topics.

First, assume that $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ is the complex number field. Denote by $\mathcal{F}_D$ the algebraic foliation on $\mathbb{C}^2$, with isolated singularities, defined by a derivation D. Note that D is simple if and only if $\mathcal{F}_D$ does not have singularities nor algebraic leaves.

An element $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}[x,y])$ is determined by $f := \rho(x)$ and $g := \rho(y)$. The associated map $R : \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ defined by $(t,u) \mapsto (f(t,u), g(t,u))$ is an automorphism in the algebraic geometric sense. If ρ commutes with D, then R maps a leaf of $\mathcal{F}_D$ onto another leaf.

Consider the group $\mathrm{Bir}(\mathcal{F}_D)$ made up of birational maps $\mathbb{C}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ which stabilize $\mathcal{F}_D$ ([SP2002], [CF2003]). We deduce that there is a natural one to one homomorphism $\varphi_D : \mathrm{Aut}(D) \to \mathrm{Bir}(\mathcal{F}_D)$. As shown in the example below, φ_D is not in general surjective. Moreover, there are foliations for which $\mathrm{Bir}(\mathcal{F}_D)$ is infinite (see *loc. cit.*).

We state a conjecture that we shall consider in a forthcoming paper:

Conjecture 1. *If D is simple, then* $\mathrm{Bir}(\mathcal{F}_D)$ *is finite.*

Example 3. Consider the derivation

$$D = (1 + xy + x^3)\partial_x + x(1 + xy)\partial_y.$$

If $j = e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}/3}$ is a primitive cubic root of the unity, the linear automorphisms $(x,y) \mapsto (j^2x, jy), (x,y) \mapsto (jx, j^2y)$ belong to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F}_D) \subset \mathrm{Bir}(\mathcal{F}_D)$ but not to $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$. On the other hand, the birational change of coordinates $u = x/y, v = 1/y$ maps $y^{-1}D$ into

$$D' = (u + v^2 - u^2v)\partial_u - u(u + v^2)\partial_v.$$

By [CDGM2010, Proposition 1.3] the associated foliation $\mathcal{F}_{D'} = \mathcal{F}_D$ has no invariant algebraic curves. Since D does not vanish in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and $y = 0$ is not stable by D we deduce that it is a simple derivation; in particular $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ is trivial.

Finally, the notion of simplicity for a derivation may be extended to an arbitrary $\mathbb{K}$-algebra in a natural form. Following the pioneering works of Seidenberg and Hart (resp. [Se1967] and [Ha1975]) one knows that the local ring of an algebraic variety at a point is regular if and only if it admits a simple derivation. In particular, a polynomial ring $A = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ over $\mathbb{K}$ admits a simple derivation at each localization by a maximal ideal and there are criteria to decide if a derivation in such a localization is simple ([BLL2003]). However, there are no simplicity criteria for derivations in A, besides Shamsuddin's criterion and a more restrictive one given by Y. Lequain in [Le2007], where an algorithm is given to decide whether a certain type of Shamsuddin derivation is simple. Furthermore, even for $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ and $n = 2$ few simple derivations are known besides the

ones given by such a criterion (see for example [No2008], [Co2008], [Sa2012], [Ko2012] and references therein). Related to these facts we have the following natural question:

How far a derivation $D \in \mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{K}}(R)$ with $\mathrm{Aut}(D) = \{id\}$ is from being simple ?

Acknowledgment: The second author thanks Jérémy Blanc for useful conversations.

2. Isotropy of simple derivations

We start with some general remarks relating D, not necessarily simple, with fixed points of elements in $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$. Let us first recall some notions.

Consider a derivation $D = a\partial_x + b\partial_y$ of $\mathbb{K}[x, y]$ and fix a point $p = (p_1, p_2) \in \mathbb{K}^2$; denote by $\mathfrak{m}$ the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{K}[x, y]$ generated by $x - p_1, y - p_2$. If a or b do not belong to $\mathfrak{m}$, then there exists a unique (convergent if $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$; see reference below for the general case) power series $\phi(t), \psi(t) \in \mathbb{K}[[t]]$ such that $\partial_t\phi(t) = a(\phi(t), \psi(t)), \partial_t\psi(t) = b(\phi(t), \psi(t))$, with $\phi(0) = p_1, \psi(0) = p_2$. Note that $a \notin \mathfrak{m}$ or $b \notin \mathfrak{m}$ is equivalent to $D(\mathfrak{m}) \not\subset \mathfrak{m}$.

A straightforward calculation shows that the $\mathbb{K}$-homomorphism $\varphi : \mathbb{K}[x, y] \to \mathbb{K}[[t]]$ defined by mapping $x \mapsto \phi(t), y \mapsto \psi(t)$ is the unique $\mathbb{K}$-homomorphism such that $\partial_t\varphi = \varphi D$ and $\varphi^{-1}(t\,\mathbb{K}[[t]]) = \mathfrak{m}$. We say that such a φ is a *solution of D passing through $\mathfrak{m}$* (see [BP2015, Thm. 7c] for other properties of this notion).

Lemma 4. *Let D be a derivation and let $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$. If ρ fixes a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ which is not stable under D, then there exists a principal ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{m}$ such that:*

a) $\mathfrak{a}$ is stable under D and fixed by ρ.

b) ρ induces the identity map in $\mathbb{K}[x, y]/\mathfrak{a}$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal such that $\rho(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m}$. Consider the unique solution $\varphi : \mathbb{K}[x, y] \to \mathbb{K}[[t]]$ of D passing through $\mathfrak{m}$. Note that D stabilizes $\ker(\varphi)$; indeed, if $\varphi(g) = 0$, then $\varphi(D(g)) = \partial_t\varphi(g) = 0$.

Since $\partial_t\varphi\rho = \varphi D\rho = \varphi\rho D$ we know that $\varphi\rho$ is a solution of D passing through $\rho^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m}$. Hence, $\varphi\rho = \varphi$ from which it follows $\rho(\ker(\varphi)) = \ker(\varphi)$.

If $g \in \mathbb{K}[x, y] \setminus \ker(\varphi)$, then $\varphi(\rho(g) - g) = 0$; so ρ induces the identity map in $\mathbb{K}[x, y]/\ker(\varphi)$.

Since $\ker(\varphi)$ is a prime ideal strictly contained in $\mathfrak{m}$ its height is 0 or 1. Hence $\ker(\varphi)$ is principal, and the proof follows by taking $\mathfrak{a} = \ker(\varphi)$.

□

Remark 5. First, note that in part a) of the lemma above the ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ may be trivial, as it happens, for example, when D is a simple derivation. Second, if $\rho = id$ the part b) of

that lemma is not informative. Finally, note that the ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ is uniquely determined by $\mathfrak{m}$ since φ is.

Corollary 6. *Let D be a simple derivation and let $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$. If $\rho \neq id$, then ρ^N does not fix maximal ideals for any N. In particular, either ρ has infinite order or $\rho = id$.*

Proof. Suppose that ρ^N fixes a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ with $N > 1$. Since $\rho^N \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$, Lemma 4a) implies there exists an ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{m}$, stable under D. Since D is simple $\mathfrak{a} = (0)$. Lemma 4b) implies $\rho^N = id$.

On the other hand, it is well known that an automorphism of finite order is conjugate to a linear one (it is an easy consequence of van der Kulk Theorem: see for example [KS1995, §2] and note that the theorem holds over $\mathbb{K}$), hence it fixes a maximal ideal. Then we apply again Lemma 4 to obtain $\rho = id$. □

Lemma 7. *Let D be a simple derivation and let $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$. If ρ stabilizes the ideal generated by $x \in \mathbb{K}[x, y]$, then $\rho = id$.*

Proof. By Corollary 6 it suffices to prove that ρ has finite order.

Assume, by contradiction, that ρ has infinite order.

There exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}^*$ such that $\rho(x) = \alpha x$. Write $\rho(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{m} g_j y^j$, for $g_j \in \mathbb{K}[x]$, $j = 0, \ldots, m$. Since the Jacobian of $(\rho(x), \rho(y))$ belongs to $\mathbb{K}^*$, we obtain $g_1 = \beta \in \mathbb{K}^*$ and $g_j = 0$ for $j > 1$, that is $\rho(y) = g(x) + \beta y$ for some $g \in \mathbb{K}[x]$. Moreover, since ρ does not fix maximal ideals, we get $\beta = 1$ and $g(0) \neq 0$; in particular $g \neq 0$.

Now assume that α is not a root of the unity and write $D = a\partial_x + b\partial_y$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{K}[x, y]$. Since $\rho D(x) = D\rho(x)$ we have $a(\alpha x, g(x)+y) = \alpha a(x, y)$. In other words, if $a = \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i y^i$ for some $a_i \in \mathbb{K}[x]$, $a_n \neq 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i(\alpha x)(g(x) + y)^i = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \alpha a_i(x) y^i.$$

Hence $a_n(\alpha x) = \alpha a_n(x)$. By the assumption on α we get $a_n(x) = A_n x$ with $A_n \in \mathbb{K}^*$.

If $n > 0$, we also have $a_{n-1}(\alpha x) + n a_n(\alpha x) g(x) = \alpha a_{n-1}(x)$, that is, we obtain

$$a_{n-1}(\alpha x) + n\alpha A_n x g(x) = \alpha a_{n-1}(x). \tag{1}$$

Since $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ is a group, one may replace α with any of its powers, hence the degree of a_{n-1} is necessarily 1. Since $a_{n-1}(0) = \alpha a_{n-1}(0)$ we have $a_{n-1}(x) = A_{n-1}x$, with $A_{n-1} \in \mathbb{K}^*$, but this is not compatible with (1) because $g \neq 0$. Then $n = 0$ and $a(x, y) = A_0 x$ with $A_0 \in \mathbb{K}^*$, which contradicts simplicity. We conclude that α is a root of the unity.

By replacing ρ with one of its powers, we may assume $\rho(x) = x$ and $\rho(y) = g(x) + y$ with $g(0) \neq 0$. As before, if $n > 0$ then (1) yields a contradiction, hence $n = 0$, that is $a(x, y) = a(x)$. Since D is simple, then $a \in \mathbb{K}^*$; indeed, if $a = 0$ the derivation D stabilizes

the ideal generated by x and if $\deg a \geq 1$ it stabilizes the ideal generated by $a(x)$. Set $a = A \in \mathbb{K}^*$.

Now we use $\rho D(y) = D\rho(y)$ to obtain $b(x, y + g(x)) = Ag'(x) + b(x, y)$. Write $b = \sum_{i=0}^{m} b_i y^i$, $b_i \in \mathbb{K}[x]$, $b_m \neq 0$; note that $b = 0$ is not possible because D is simple. If $m > 1$, by arguing as in the case $n > 0$ above we obtain a contradiction with $g \neq 0$. Then either $m = 0$ and $b(x, y) = b(x)$ or $m = 1$ and $b_1(x)g(x) = Ag'(x)$. Since $A\partial_x$ is a simple derivation on $\mathbb{K}[x]$, the former case contradicts Shamsuddin's criterion (see [Sh1977] or [No1994, Thm. 13.2.1]), whereas the latter is clearly not possible by degree reasons.

Thus ρ has finite order, which completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1. Suppose $\mathrm{Aut}(D) \neq \{id\}$ and take $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)\backslash\{id\}$. By Corollary 6 we know that ρ has infinite order and none of its powers fix maximal ideals.

By a result of Lane (see [La1975]) we know that ρ stabilizes a nontrivial ideal $\mathfrak{a}$. Then a power ρ^N of ρ stabilizes the minimal associated primes of $\mathfrak{a}$, which cannot be maximal ideals. By replacing ρ with ρ^N, we may suppose that ρ stabilizes a prime ideal of height 1. Hence we assume there exists an irreducible polynomial $h \in \mathbb{K}[x, y]$ and an element $\mu \in \mathbb{K}^*$ such that $\rho(h) = \mu h$.

Note that a singular point of the curve $(h = 0)$ corresponds to a maximal ideal which is fixed by a power of ρ, hence such a point cannot exist.

From a result of Blanc and Stampfli ([BS2015, Theorem 2]) we deduce that there exists $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x, y])$ such that $\sigma(h)$ is either of the form x or $x^r y^s - \lambda$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}^*$, and r, s are relatively prime positive integers. By replacing ρ and D with $\sigma\rho\sigma^{-1}$ and $\sigma D\sigma^{-1}$, respectively, we may assume $h = x$ or $h = x^r y^s - \lambda$.

By Lemma 7 the first possibility does not occur. Then assume $\rho(x^r y^s - \lambda) = \mu(x^r y^s - \lambda)$, with $\mu \in \mathbb{K}^*$; write $\rho(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} f_i y^i$ and $\rho(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{m} g_j y^j$, where $f_i, g_j \in \mathbb{K}[x]$, $i = 0, \ldots, n$ and $j = 0, \ldots, m$. Hence $f_n^r g_m^s y^{rn+sm} = \mu x^r y^s$, from which it follows $n = 0, m = 1$. Recalling that the Jacobian determinant associated to ρ is a nonzero constant, we conclude $\rho(x) = \alpha x, \rho(y) = g_0 + \beta y$ for suitable $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{K}^*$. Then we have

$$(\alpha x)^r (g_0 + \beta y)^s = \mu x^r y^s + \lambda(1 - \mu),$$

which implies $g_0 = 0$ and ρ fixes the maximal ideal (x, y): contradiction. Hence the proof of Theorem 1 is complete. □

3. Automorphisms of Shamsuddin derivations

Let $D = \partial_x + (ay+b)\partial_y$ be a Shamsuddin derivation. Let $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}[x,y])$. If $\rho(x) = f, \rho(y) = g$, then $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$ if and only if f and g verify

$$\begin{cases} \partial_x(f) + (ay+b)\partial_y(f) = 1 \\ \partial_x(g) + (ay+b)\partial_y(g) = \rho(a)g + \rho(b) \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Writing $f = f_0(x) + \ldots + f_n(x)y^n$ and $g = g_0(x) + \ldots + g_m(x)y^m$ we obtain that (2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} f_0' + bf_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(f_i' + iaf_i + (i+1)bf_{i+1})y^i + (f_n' + naf_n)y^n = 1 \\ g_0' + bg_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{m-1}(g_j' + jag_j + (j+1)bg_{j+1})y^j + (g_m' + mag_m)y^m = \rho(a)g + \rho(b); \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

note that if we consider the polynomials a, b, f and g as polynomial functions, then we have $\rho(a) = a \circ f, \rho(b) = b \circ g$.

In the following example we treat the trivial case where $a = b = 0$.

Example 8. If $a = b = 0$, then $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(D) = \mathrm{Aut}(\partial_x)$ if and only if there exist $P \in \mathbb{K}[y]$ and $d \in \mathbb{K}, \beta \in \mathbb{K}^*$ such that

$$\rho(x) = x + P(y), \rho(y) = d + \beta y,$$

i.e., $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ is a semidirect product $\mathrm{J_o} \rtimes (\mathbb{K} \ltimes \mathbb{K}^*)$, where $(\mathbb{K} \ltimes \mathbb{K}^*)$ has structure given by

$$(d_1, \beta_1) \cdot (d_2, \beta_2) = (d_1 + d_2\beta_1, \beta_1\beta_2),$$

and

$$\mathrm{J_o} = \{\sigma : \sigma(x) = x + P(y), \sigma(y) = y, P \in \mathbb{K}[y]\}$$

is the so-called *de Jonquières* group.

From now on we assume that a Shamsuddin derivation verifies $ay + b \neq 0$.

Proposition 9. *Let $D = \partial_x + (ay+b)\partial_y$ be a Shamsuddin derivation with $a \neq 0$. We have the following assertions:*

i) If $a \in \mathbb{K}^*, b = 0$, then $\mathrm{Aut}(D) = \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^*$

ii) If $a, b \in \mathbb{K}^*$, then $\mathrm{Aut}(D) = \mathbb{K} \times (\mathbb{K} \ltimes \mathbb{K}^*)$.

iii) If $\deg a \geq 1$ or $\deg b \geq 1$, then

$$A(D) = \{\rho; \rho(x) = x, \rho(y) = g_0 + dy, g_0' = ag_0 + b(1-d), d \in \mathbb{K}^*\};$$

in particular, if $b = 0$ we have $\mathrm{Aut}(D) = \mathbb{K}^*$.

Proof. First we note that $f = f_0 = x + c$ and $g = g_0 + dy$ for suitable $c \in \mathbb{K}, d \in \mathbb{K}^*$. Indeed, $n > 0$ contradicts $f_n' + naf_n = 0$ in the top equality in (3); hence $f = x + c$ for

some $c \in \mathbb{K}$, and then $m \geq 1$ because ρ is an automorphism. Moreover, the Jacobian determinant of ρ is $\sum_{i=1}^{m} i g_i y^{i-1}$ and belongs to $\mathbb{K}^*$, from which the assertion follows.

Furthermore, from the bottom equality in (3) we obtain

$$g_0' + bd = a(x+c)g_0 + b(x+c); \tag{4}$$

here $a(x+c)$ (analogously $b(x+c)$) denotes the polynomial a, thought as a polynomial function, composed with $f = x + c$.

Now, if $b = 0$ we get $g_0' := D(g_0) = \rho(a)g_0$, whence $g_0 = 0$, because otherwise $\deg g_0' \geq \deg g_0$, which is not possible. We obtain

$$\mathrm{Aut}(D) = \{\rho; \rho(x) = x + c, \rho(y) = dy, c \in \mathbb{K}, d \in \mathbb{K}^*\},$$

and the assertion $i)$ follows easily.

On the other hand, since $\rho^\ell \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$ for all $\ell \geq 1$, we deduce that the right hand side in both equalities of (4) does not depend on c. Then $\deg a \geq 1$ or $\deg b \geq 1$ implies $c = 0$. Indeed, if $c \neq 0$ the second of these implies $a \in \mathbb{K}$, and then $b \in \mathbb{K}$.

If $\deg a \geq 1$ or $\deg b \geq 1$ (and $c = 0$), from $g_0' + bd = ag_0 + b$ it follows $g_0' = ag_0 + b(1-d)$, which proves $iii)$.

Finally, assume $a, b \in \mathbb{K}^*$ and take $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$. We know that $\rho_i(x) = x + c_i, c_i \in \mathbb{K}$, and $\rho_i(y) = \alpha_i + d_i y$, with $(\alpha_i, d_i) \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^*$. Then

$$\rho_1\rho_2(x) = c_1 + c_2, \quad \rho_1\rho_2(y) = \alpha_2 + d_2\alpha_1 + d_1 d_2 y.$$

If we consider the semidirect product structure $\mathbb{K} \ltimes \mathbb{K}^*$ with operation given by $(\alpha_1, d_1) \ltimes (\alpha_2, d_2) \mapsto (\alpha_2 + d_2\alpha_1, d_1 d_2)$ we obtain statement $ii)$, which completes the proof. □

Note that the statement $iii)$ of the Proposition above does not say anything about whether $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ is trivial. Indeed, let us see two examples.

Example 10. Take $a = x^2, b = x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^2 - 2x + \epsilon$, for $\epsilon \in \mathbb{K}$; denote by D_ϵ the associated Shamsuddin derivation. As it follows from Proposition 9, part iii), we have $\rho(y) = g_0 + dy$ with $\deg g_0 \leq \deg b - \deg a$. A direct computation shows that the relation $g_0' = ag_0 + b(1-d)$ admits solutions with $d \neq 1$ if and only if $\epsilon = -1$. Furthermore, in this case we obtain solutions given by $g_0 = g_e = -ex^3 - ex^2 - ex - 4e$ and $d = 1 - e$, for $e \in \mathbb{K}\backslash\{1\}$. If we denote by $\rho_e \in \mathrm{Aut}(D_{-1})$ the automorphism defined by $\rho_e(y) = g_e + (1-e)y$, then we have $\rho_e^{-1} = \rho_k$ with $k = e/(e-1)$. We deduce $\mathrm{Aut}(D_{-1}) \neq \{id\}$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(D_\epsilon) = \{id\}$ if $\epsilon \neq -1$.

Example 11. Consider the Shamsuddin derivation $D = \partial_x + (2xy + x^3)\partial_y$; note D stabilizes the ideal generated by $2y + x^2 + 1$. A straightforward computation using part $iii)$ of Proposition 9 shows that $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ is the 1-parameter family of non-linear automorphisms

ρ_t, $t \in \mathbb{K}^*$, defined by

$$\rho_t(x) = x, \quad \rho_t(y) = \frac{(t-1)}{2}(x^2+1) + ty.$$

Note that this family is in fact a 1-parameter subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$.

Corollary 12. *Assume $a \neq 0$. If $\deg a \geq 1$ or $\deg b \geq 1$, then $\mathrm{Aut}(D) \neq \{id\}$ if and only if there exists $h \in \mathbb{K}[x]$ such that $D(h) = ah + b$. In particular, if $b \neq 0$ one has $\deg b \geq \deg a$.*

Proof. Take $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(D) \setminus \{id\}$. Part *iii)* of Proposition 9 implies $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$ if and only if there exists $g_0 \in \mathbb{K}[x]$ and $d \in \mathbb{K}^*$ with $g_0' = ag_0 + b(1-d)$ such that $\rho(x) = x$ and $\rho(y) = g_0 + dy$. Since $\rho = id$ corresponds to $d \neq 1$, the first assertion follows by taking h to be $(1-d)^{-1}g_0$. The rest of the proof is clear. □

Proof of Theorem 2. By ([Sh1977]), D is simple if and only if there is no $h \in \mathbb{K}[x]$ such that $D(h) = ah + b$. Moreover, by Theorem 1 it suffices to prove the "if" part of the theorem. Thus, by Proposition 9 we have $\deg a \geq 1$ or $\deg b \geq 1$, and the assertion follows from Corollary 12.

□

We finish the paper by giving an example of isotropy elements for Shamsuddin derivations with $a = 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{K}^*$; we do not know how to treat the general case.

Example 13. Suppose $a = 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{K}^*$. We are looking for elements in $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ with $n = 0$, where n is as in (2). In this case we obtain, as before, $f = f_0 = x + c$ from which it follows $m = 1, g_1 \in \mathbb{K}^*$ and (4) becomes

$$g_0' + bg_1 = b.$$

An automorphism $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$ with $n = 0$ is then defined by $\rho(x) = x + c$ and $\rho(y) = d + b(1-\beta)x + \beta y$ for a $\beta \in \mathbb{K}^*$. There is then a bijection between $\mathbb{K} \times (\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^*)$ and such elements in $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ given by

$$(c, (d, \beta)) \mapsto (\rho(x), \rho(y)). \tag{5}$$

In fact the subset of elements in $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ with $n = 0$ is a subgroup isomorphic to a semidirect structure $\mathbb{K} \rtimes (\mathbb{K} \ltimes \mathbb{K}^*)$. Indeed, note that for elements $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$ with

$$\rho_i(x) = x + c_i, \rho_i(y) = d_i + b(1-\beta_i)x + \beta_i y, i = 1, 2$$

we have $\rho_1\rho_2(x) = x + c_1 + c_2$ and $\rho_1\rho_2(y) = d_2 + \beta_2 d_1 + b(1 - \beta_1\beta_2)x + \beta_1\beta_2 y$; under the bijection (5) the product $\rho_1\rho_2$ corresponds to $(c_1 + c_2, (d_2 + \beta_2 d_1, \beta_1\beta_2))$. Hence we have an exact sequence of groups

$$\mathbb{K} \longrightarrow \mathbb{K} \rtimes (\mathbb{K} \ltimes \mathbb{K}^*) \longrightarrow \mathbb{K} \ltimes \mathbb{K}$$

where the homomorphisms are, respectively, $c \mapsto (c,(0,1)), (c,(d,\beta)) \mapsto (d,\beta)$, the semidirect product structure on the right-hand side being given by

$$(d_1,\beta_1) \rtimes (d_1,\beta_1) = (d_2 + \beta_2 d_1, \beta_1\beta_2).$$

References

[Ba] R. Baltazar, *On simple Shamsudding derivations in two variables*, An. Acad. Bras. de Ciênc., to appear.

[BP2015] R. Baltazar and I. Pan, *On solutions for derivations of a Noetherian k-algebra and local simplicity*, Comm. in Algebra, v.43 7 (2015), pp. 2739-2747.

[BS2015] J. Blanc and I. Stampfli, *Automorphisms of the plane preserving a curve*, J. of Algebraic Geometry, 2. No. 2 (2015), pp. 193-213.

[BLL2003] P. Brumatti, Y. Lequain and D. Levcovitz, *Differential simplicity in polynomial rings and algebraic independence of power series*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 68 (2003), pp. 615-630.

[CDGM2010] D. Cerveau, J. Déserti, D. Garba Benko and R. Meziani, *Géométrie classique de certains feuilletages quadratiques*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.), 41 (2010), no. 2, pp. 161-198.

[CF2003] S. Cantat and Ch. Favre, *Symétries birationnelles des surfaces feuilletés*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 561 (2003), pp. 199-235.

[Co2008] S. C. Coutinho, *On the classification of simple quadratic derivations over the affine plane*, Journal of Algebra, Volume 319, Issue 10 (2008), pp. 4249-4274.

[Ha1975] R. Hart, *Derivations on regular local rings of finitely generated type*, J. London Math. Soc. (2), 10 (1975), pp. 292-294.

[Ko2012] S. Kour, *Some simple derivations of $k[x,y]$*, Communications in Algebra, vol. 40, (2012), pp. 4100-4110.

[KS1995] H. Kraft and G. Schwarz, *Finite automorphisms of affine n-space*, in *Automorphisms of affine spaces*, Springer, (1996), pp. 55-66.

[La1975] D.R. Lane, *Fixed points of affine Cremona transformations of the plane over an algebraically closed field*, Amer. J. Math., 97, 3 (1975), pp. 707-732.

[Le2007] Y. Lequain, *Simple Shamsuddin derivations of $K[X;Y_1,\ldots,Y_n]$: an algorithmic characterization*, J. of Pure and Appl. Algebra 212 (2008), pp. 801807.

[No1994] A. Nowicki, *Polynomial derivations and their rings of constants*, at http://www-users.mat.umk.pl/∼anow/ps-dvi/pol-der.pdf

[No2008] A. Nowicki, *An example of a simple derivation in two variables*, Colloq. Mathem. 113 (2008) pp. 25-31.

[Sa2012] C. Saraiva de Oliveira, *Sobre derivações simples e folheações sem solução algébrica*, Thesis UFRJ/COPPE, 2012.

[Se1967] A. Seidenberg, *Differential ideals in rings of finitely generated type*, American Journal of Mathematics, Vol. 89, No. 1 (1967), pp. 22-42.

[SP2002] P. F. Sanchez and J. V. Pereira, *Transformation groups of holomorphic foliations* Communications in Analysis and Geometry, 10 no.5 (2002), pp. 1115-1123.

[Sh1977] A. Shamsuddin, Ph.D. thesis, Univesity of Leeds, 1977.

Luís Gustavo Doninelli Mendes, Instituto de Matemática, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, BRASIL mendes@mat.ufrgs.br

Ivan Pan, Centro de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias, UdelaR, Montevideo - URUGUAY ivan@cmat.edu.uy